

REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Office Action dated October 29, 2008. Claims 1-198 are pending in the application. Claims 66-142 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner for being directed to a non-elected Group. Claims 1-65 and 143-198 stand rejected.

Applicant has canceled claims 11, 21-22, 48, 147, and 177 without prejudice, and amended the claims as shown above, to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. No new matter has been added.

Entry of the foregoing amendment and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-65 and 143-198 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended the claims, obviating this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 and § 103

Claims 1-65 and 143-198 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tsurutani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,472,792; hereafter "Tsurutani").

Applicant has amended the claims, rendering this rejection moot. At the very least, Tsurutani does not teach, show, or suggest a first layer comprising a lower crystallinity polymer having of from 72 wt% to about 90 wt% propylene and of from 10 wt% to 20 wt% ethylene, based on the total weight of the lower crystallinity polymer; a melting point, as determined by DSC, of from 20°C to 110°C; and a Mooney viscosity (ML(1+4)@125°C) of about 60 or less; and a second layer comprising a higher crystallinity polymer comprising polypropylene, wherein said higher crystallinity polymer has a melting point as determined by DSC which is at least

USSN: 10/540,495
Attorney Docket No. 2003B002/2
Reply to Office Action dated October 29, 2008
March 2, 2009

25°C higher than that of said lower crystallinity polymer, as required in every claim. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated, since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to affect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to affect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712 (Docket #: 2003B002/2).

Respectfully submitted,

March 2, 2009

Date

/Stephen Timmins/

Stephen Timmins
U.S. Registration No. 48,481

ExxonMobil Chemical Company
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
(281) 834-2866 Office